

Appl. No. 10/632,884
Amdt. dated November 16, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 3, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,623,080. In Amendment A, filed November 9, 2004, Applicant stated that he submitted a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c). However, it was determined that the terminal disclaimer was not submitted with Amendment A. Applicant herewith submits the terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c), along with the appropriate fee, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

There are no other amendments or changes submitted with this supplemental amendment. The listing of claims is identical to that included in Amendment A, filed November 9, 2004. Applicant incorporates herein by reference the Remarks/Arguments included in Amendment A.

This supplemental amendment is submitted well within the shortened statutory period for reply to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2004. Applicant respectfully

Appl. No. 10/632,884
Amdt. dated November 16, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 3, 2004

requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections, allow the claims, and pass the case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSTER, LIEDER, WOODRUFF, & LUCCHESI, L.C.

By



Ned W. Randle
Reg. No. 35,989
Polster, Lieders, Woodruff & Lucchesi L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
314-238-2400
314-238-2401 facsimile